AOPC: 23- Information for UPRR Albina

| Category | Type of Information | Site Information |
|-------------------------|---|---|
| AOPC Information | | |
| Location | Location (RM) | RM 9.85–10.2 |
| | River Side | E |
| Nearby Upland | Upland Properties | Ash Grove Cement Co. For UPRR Only |
| Properties | Adjacent to AOPC | |
| Surface Area | AOPC Size (acres) | 17.6 |
| COCs | | |
| COC Information | Primary COCs (Mapping) | PCBs, Toxicity |
| | Secondary COCs | Lindane (fish consumption) |
| | Exposure Pathways | Fish consumption |
| COC Distribution | Horizontal Distribution | Area of PCB and PAH contamination offshore of |
| | (summary) | Ash Grove Cement. Generally level 1 or no |
| | | benthic toxicity. |
| | Vertical Distribution | |
| | (summary) | |
| COC | Chemical Mobility Data | |
| Characteristics | | |
| COC | Surface and Transition | |
| Characteristics | Water Chemistry Data | |
| | Fish Tissue Chemistry | |
| | Data | |
| | Principle Threat and/or | |
| | Hot Spots | |
| Potential Sources | | |
| Potential Upland | Upland Source Migration | |
| Sources | Pathways and COCs | |
| | Integration with Upland | |
| | Source Control | |
| In Motor | Measures | |
| In-Water Sources | In-water sediment and surface water sources | |
| Recontamination | Evaluation of upland and | |
| Potential | in-water sources | |
| Current and Future | | |
| Human Activities | River Use | 1 dock; shoreline is beach with recreational/ |
| i iuiiiaii Activities | INVEL USE | transient human use area between RM 9.85 |
| | | (upper extent of AOPC) and 9.9 |
| | Adjacent Land Use | (apper extent of Not o) and 3.3 |
| | Accessibility | |
| Habitat | Type - open water, | Shorebird habitat from upper extent of AOPC |
| Tabilat | wetland, shallows, | (RM 9.85) to RM 9.9; no amphibian habitat |
| | vegetative shoreline | identified |
| Future Site use | Future Site Uses | Tagrisinou . |
| i ataro one ase | . atai 0 01t0 0000 | |

| 0.1 | T | 0''. 1 6 |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|
| Category | Type of Information | Site Information |
| Site Characteristic | | |
| Navigation | Active shipping/berthing | |
| | area | M III I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I I |
| | Maintenance Dredging | Multiple dredging events along navigation |
| | | channel from upper (RM 9.85) to lower (RM 10.2) |
| | | extent of AOPC; Ash Grove dredging for berth |
| | | maintenance planned (2010) near dock RM 10, |
| | | 7,850 cu yd |
| 01 () | Prop wash Potential | |
| Obstructions | Utility Crossing | |
| | Presence of in-water | 1 large dock between RM 10.0 and 10.2 |
| | structures | |
| | Subsurface Features | |
| | (e.g., hardpan or | |
| E. 15: | bedrock) | |
| Flood Rise | Location and | |
| | configuration | 0/ N |
| Erosion, Wave | Erosional or Depositional | % Neutral Area = 30, % Erosional Area = 13, % |
| Energy, Stability, | Potential | Depositional Area = 57; Mean bathymetric |
| | Mata Danile (6) | change (2002 - 2004) -0.18 ft +/- 0.48 (1 std dev) |
| | Water Depth (ft) - | Avg Depth for AOPC 23 = 30' (+/- 13') (1 std dev) |
| | min/max/avg | Design of the second se |
| | Bank and Beach Type | Predominantly unclassified fill with non-vegetated |
| | | riprap from upper extent of AOPC (RM 9.85) to |
| | Diver Dellers Olere | RM 9.0 and seawall from RM 10.1 to 10.15 |
| | River Bottom Slope | AOPC 23 has 6.2 acres greater than 10 pct slope |
| Pottom Dobrio | Coverage/Type | out of a total of 17.6 acres or 35% |
| Bottom Debris Sediment Charact | Coverage/Type | |
| | | Predominantly sandy mud except around |
| Physical | USGS Sediment Type ¹ | channelward border of AOPC at RM 9.95 where |
| Properties | | |
| | Total Organic Carbon | muddy sand Mean (± SD): 1.8 (0.3), Min: 0.8, Max: 2.3, large |
| | Total Organic Carbon | area of elevated concentrations between RM |
| | | 9.95 and lower extent of AOPC (RM 10.2) |
| Other | | 9.95 and lower extent of AOT C (NW 10.2) |
| Other Issues | Site specific | |
| General Response | | |
| No Action | - Notions | |
| Institutional | | |
| Controls | | |
| MNR | | |
| Containment | | |
| Removal and | | |
| Disposal | | |
| Dispusai | | |

¹ The sediment types use 20% and 50% as "cut-off" limits. For example, pure sand has less than 20% of mud or gravel; sandy mud has greater than 50% mud and more than 20% sand; muddy sand has greater than 50% sand and more than 20% mud.

| Category | Type of Information | Site Information |
|-------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| Treatment (in- | | |
| situ and ex-situ) | | |

- 1) What are the upland COIs? What are the general levels of the most significant upland contamination relative to JSCS SLVs (10x, 100x, 1000x, etc)? Metals, TPH-dx, TPH heavy oil, PAHs, PCBs (no known releases or sources just minor detections in two CBs). No significant excendences of more that 10x to indicate source area except for diesel LNAPL in groundwater. Most significant exceedence were metal (PB at 10x 100x SLVs) in catch basin sediment and erodable soils which was removed.
- 2) What are the upland sources (e.g., tank release, facility operations, etc)? Petroleum releases from AST and subsurface lube oil piping, UST and small scale chemical spills related to general railroad operations over the years. List on known spills in documented in draft RI report.
- 3) What are the current or reasonably likely future contaminant migration pathways linking the uplands to the river (e.g., GW, stormwater, bank erosion, etc)? Stormwater. GW is partially impacted by petroleum releases onsite (LNAPL present in limited area) but does not appear to be making it to river, i.e. plume seems stable but final interpretation of that has yet to be determined
- 4) What's the relative recontamination potential of upland sources? i.e., if an effective source control measure is **not** implemented for a complete contaminant migration pathway (e.g., GW plume), will that pathway likely result the recontamination of a future in-river remedy (e.g., cap)? Stormwater source control measure (line cleanout, system repair) has already been completed and effectiveness is being evaluated.
- 5) What's the current & anticipated future land use of the facility & sites surrounding the facility? Railroad/industrial
- 6) Are there active over-water structures (e.g., docks, wharfs), & is it anticipated these structures will be used in the future? Is the riverbank, beach & nearshore easily accessible from the upland (e.g., "no" because it's covered by wharves or steep rip-rap). No over-water activities from railroad. Only part of waterfront that is accessible on site is the southernmost section of yard. The southernmost beach the has a vegetative/erosion control mat placed on it to control erodable soil on the top of bank and slope. The area is accessible from river b/c of beach but then steep slope.
- 7) Are there any under-river utility crossings in the area? Are there any subsurface sediment obstructions (e.g., buried ships, hard pan, shallow bedrock, etc)? *Unkown*
- 8) What is the general schedule for completing the phase(s) of source control? SCE sampling complete, measures (cleanout, repairs) complete. DEQ needs to get comments to them. Will likely request additional performance monitoring sampling.
- 9) Any DEQ PM comments on the in-water information in the FS Matrices? No